

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-16 are all the claims pending in the application. In response to the Office Action, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims define patentable subject matter.

Claims 1-3, 5-10, and 12-16 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Troxel (U.S. Patent No. 6,147,970) in view of Wang et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,748,435, hereafter “Wang”). Claims 4 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Troxel in view of Wang and further in view of Chang et al. (U.S. patent No. 5,367,523, hereafter “Chang”). Applicant respectfully traverses the prior art rejections.

In the Amendment filed on August 28, 2007, Applicant argued that there is no teaching or suggestion in Troxel of the feature “if said actual value of said traffic reservation parameter exceeds said threshold value for said traffic reservation parameter, determining said packet marking of and marking each of said packets based on said actual value of said traffic reservation parameter, and if said actual value of said traffic reservation parameter is below said threshold value for said traffic reservation parameter, determining said packet marking of and marking each of said packets based on a pre-assigned priority of the packet”, as recited in independent claim 1 and analogously recited in independent claims 8 and 16.

In response, the Examiner asserts:

Troxel discloses that high priority packets are compared to the direct value of token counter 90, whereas low priority packets are compared to the value of token counter minus the normal priority threshold value (see Troxel, col. 20, lines 46-51). Thus, even in the case of low priority packets being marked non-conforming,

the pre-assigned priority of the packets is taken into consideration to determine what value the packets are to be compared against.¹

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's position. The Examiner continues to take the position that this feature of the claim reads on the disclosure of column 20, lines 46-51 of Troxel. However, this cited portion of Troxel merely discloses a traffic policing method wherein high priority packets are compared to the value of a token counter 90, and low priority packets are compared to the value of the counter 90 minus a normal priority threshold value 94. When either type of packet is below the compared value, the packet is marked as "non-conforming", and the non-conforming packets are dropped (column 20, lines 52-55).

Accordingly, Troxel does not disclose that if the actual value of a traffic reservation parameter is below a threshold value, packets are marked based on a pre-assigned priority of the packet, as claimed. In Troxel, the packets are marked as non-conforming based on whether they are below a threshold, and not based on their priority, since Troxel clearly discloses that if either type of packet (low priority or high priority packets) are below a compared value, they are marked as "non-conforming".

Further, Chang and Wang do not cure the deficiencies of Troxel.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 8, and 16 should be allowable because the cited references do not teach or suggest all of the features of the claims. Dependent claims 2-7 and 9-15 should also be allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on independent claims 1 and 8.

¹ Page 6 of the Office Action dated November 15, 2007.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
U.S. Appln. No.: 10/026,690

Attorney Docket No.: Q67666

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark E. Wallerson/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

Mark E. Wallerson
Registration No. 59,043

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: February 14, 2008